

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected previous claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Marchosky. In Marchosky, medical records of individual patients are provided. The user of the system may be the patient himself seeking access to his own medical record or others such as healthcare providers' for instance a pharmacist or doctor. Depending on whom the user of the system seeking access is, various portions of the patient record may be accessed. For example if the patient is accessing his own file, then he may access his entire file. On the other hand, if the person seeking access is a pharmacist, for example, the pharmacist may only access portions of the file relating to drugs. See page 8, paragraph 0075, for example.

In Marchosky, the patient file (data object) is identified by a unique number assigned to the patient to which that data object patient file relates. Claim 26 clearly distinguishes at least since the electronic data object identifier identifies a content of information stored in the data object whereas the electronic user identifier of an operating personnel of the system seeking access to the data is an identifier which is different than the data object identifier. Claim 26 thus readily distinguishes since Marchosky only has a patient number identifying the patient file as the data object.

Claim 26 further distinguishes by reciting determining the access right dependent on the data object identifier and also dependent on the user identifier. In Marchosky, there is only a patient number identifying the patient file, and the access to the patient file is determined by the patient number only and not dependent on both a user identifier and a data object identifier. Thus claim 26 readily distinguishes.

Claim 27 distinguishes at least by reciting a plurality of access right categories and determining an association of the user identifier with at least one of the access right categories, the access right being determined dependent on the association of the user identifier with the at least one access right category. Marchosky only has a patient ID number for the data object patient file and does not teach this association.

Dependent claim 28 distinguishes at least by reciting providing a plurality of access right categories and determining an association of the data object identifier with at least one of the access right categories, the access right being determined dependent on the association of the data object identifier with the at least one access right category. Marchosky only has a patient ID number for the data object patient file and does not teach this association.

Dependent claim 29 distinguishes at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 26.


Independent claim 30 distinguishes in a fashion similar to claim 26 but also recites in combination the method steps from dependent claims 27 and 28 above.

System claim 31 distinguishes at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 26. Dependent claims 32-35 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 31 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 258-5786
Attorneys for Applicants.
CUSTOMER NO. 26574

CHI\5604708.1